



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/767,044	01/29/2004	Gregory Richard Hintermeister	ROC920030050US1	4831
7590 Grant A. Johnson IBM Corporation, Dept. 917 3605 Highway 52 North Rochester, MN 55901-7829			EXAMINER DESAI, RACHNA SINGH	
			ART UNIT 2176	PAPER NUMBER
			MAIL DATE 12/30/2009	DELIVERY MODE PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/767,044	Applicant(s) HINTERMEISTER ET AL.	
	Examiner RACHNA S. DESAI	Art Unit 2176	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on ____.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 22-32 and 34-43 is/are pending in the application.
 4a) Of the above claim(s) ____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 22-32 and 34-43 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) ____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on ____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. ____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. ____. |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date ____. | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: ____. |

DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is responsive to communications: Amendments and Remarks filed on 09/21/09.

2. Claims 1-21 have been cancelled. Claims 22-32 and 34-43 are now pending. Claims 22, 30, and 35 are independent claims.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

3. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

4. Claims 30-32 and 34 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. The claims recite both a product and method steps which makes the claim ambiguous. It is not clear if Applicant is attempting to claim the product or the method. Correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

5. 35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

Art Unit: 2176

Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

6. Claims 30-32 and 34 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because they are directed to nonstatutory subject matter.

Claims 30-32 and 34 recite "computer-readable storage media" which has been defined by Applicant on page 11 of the Specification as "signal bearing media" which includes carrier waves and signals. See lines 18-26 which recites, "Examples of signal bearing media include. . .alterable information stored on writable storage media". Therefore, claims 30-34 are not limited to tangible embodiments. As such, the claim is not limited to statutory subject matter and is therefore non-statutory.

Further, to expedite a complete examination of the instant application the claims rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 (nonstatutory) above are further rejected as set forth below in anticipation of applicant amending these claims to make them statutory.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

7. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

8. **Claims 22-25, and 29-31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Wan, US 7,461,168 B1, 12/02/08 (filed 09/15/00).**

Regarding claim 22, Wan discloses a method for displaying information online such as through a web page which meets the preamble.

Wan discloses *receiving a multi-image file via a network interface, wherein the multi-image file consists of a single data file comprising a primary image and a plurality of secondary images adapted for cooperative display*. See figures 12-13, the <ImageGroup id> which is the multi-image file which is a single data file and <image href> tags which identify the primary and secondary images. Wan discloses the primary and secondary images can be different versions of an image such as of a rocket before it is launched and while it is launching. See figure 13.

Wan discloses *receiving a web page containing a markup language tag via the network interface, the markup language tag comprising code specifying a first subset of the images in the multi-image file that should be displayed*. See figures 12-13, column 2, lines 39-67, column 17, lines 25-30 and column 18, lines 1-20 where markup language tags indicates which image of the multi-image file should be displayed or which "fragment" of a resource should be displayed using the <ImageGroupID> and <image href> markup language tags.

Wan discloses *selectively displaying only the specified subset of images from the multi-image file on a display unit*. See figure 13, column 1, lines 20-34 and columns 17-19 which discuss rendering a web page. See figures 12-13, column 2, lines

39-67, column 17, lines 25-30 and column 18, lines 1-20 where markup language tags indicates which image of the multi-image file should be displayed or which "fragment" of a resource should be displayed using the <ImageGroupID> and <image href> markup language tags.

Regarding claim 23, Wan discloses *an information header containing an image name for each image in the multi-image file* as in figure 13. See the <ImageGroupId='RocketImages'> and <Imagehref='#BeforeLaunch'>.

Regarding claim 24, Wan discloses the information header comprises a *primary image indicator*. See figure 13 where the primary image is the first image, <Imagehref='#BeforeLaunch'>.

Regarding claim 25, Wan discloses *the information header further comprises an image location in the multi-image file for each image*. See figure 13 where for each image group, the location of the file is identified by <Image href>.

Regarding claim 29, Wan discloses the markup language tag can be in XML or **HTML**. See column 1, lines 64-67 through column 2, lines 1-6.

Regarding claim 30, Wan discloses a method for displaying information online such as through a web page which meets the preamble.

Wan discloses ***receiving a multi-image file via a network interface, the multi-image file consists of a single data file comprising a plurality of independent images including a primary image and at least one secondary image***. See figures 12-13, the <ImageGroup id> which is the multi-image file which is a single data file and <image href> tags which identify the primary and secondary images. Wan discloses the primary and secondary images can be different versions of an image such as of a rocket before it is launched and while it is launching. See figure 13.

Wan discloses ***selecting a first subset of the images in the multi-image file for display***. See figures 12-13, column 2, lines 39-67, column 17, lines 25-30 and column 18, lines 1-20 where the code indicates which images of the multi-image file should be displayed or which "fragment" of a resource should be displayed. See figures 12-13, the <ImageGroup id> which is the multi-image file which is a single data file and <image href> tags which identify the primary and secondary images. Wan discloses the primary and secondary images can be different versions of an image such as of a rocket before it is launched and while it is launching. See figure 13.

Wan discloses ***displaying the selected images on a display unit***. See figure 13, column 1, lines 20-34 and columns 17-20 which discuss rendering fragment of content.

Regarding claim 31, Wan teaches a **web browser** renders images as in column 1, lines 20-34 and column 17, lines 30-67.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

9. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

10. Claims 26-27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wan, US 7,461,168 B1, 12/02/08 (filed 09/15/00) in view of Miller et al., US 2005/0185055 A1, 08/25/05 (filed 12/08/00).

In reference to claims 26-27, Wan does not teach in response to an event displaying the web page with a secondary image wherein the event is a mouse-over event; however, Miller does. Miller teaches user instructions are also displayed, to tell the user to click on the "nicest looking" small picture, which then appears in the preferred image window. The user uses a standard input device, such as the **mouse**, to make this selection in block. For example, if the user preferred the appearance of the image with lower than normal contrast, the user would click on image. In response, the CPU would update the display on the display monitor so that the image displayed in preferred image window had lower than normal contrast, matching the contrast of the selected image, and move the indicator to surround image. At this point, the user can select a different image from among images, in order to display images with other

appearances as large images in the preferred image window, or the user can select the "done" icon. See page 4, paragraph [0036]. This meets the limitation, ***in response to an event displaying the web page with a second subset of the plurality of secondary images wherein the event is a mouse-over event.*** It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate a mouse-over event for displaying the web page with a secondary image, as taught by Miller, within the system of Wan as a means for displaying a second image because it enables interactive functions to be used by the user allowing them to carry out image manipulations. See page 4, paragraph [0036].

11. Claims 28, 32, and 34-43 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wan, US 7,461,168 B1, 12/02/08 (filed 09/15/00) in view of Munro et al., US 2002/0089549 A1, July 11, 2002.

Regarding claim 28, Wan does not teach the plurality of independent images comprise a menu element.

Munro teaches storing multiple images in a single image file. The multiple images can make up a composition of thumbnail type images for simultaneous display in a browser window. See page 1, paragraph [0008]. The bitmap image has a hierarchal system of folders associated with the bitmap image. See page 1, paragraph [0009]. This meets the limitation, **the plurality of independent images comprises a menu item.**

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have substituted the images of Wan to include images comprising menu items as suggested by Munro because one of ordinary skill in the art would have been able to carry out such a substitution, and the results were reasonably predictable.

Regarding claim 32, Wan does not disclose the primary and secondary image comprise complementary layers.

Munro teaches the images can be placed in separate layers; the upper layer will overlay the lower one when there is an overlap which meets the limitation ***the primary image and the secondary image comprise complementary layers***. See page 4-5, paragraph [0044].

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have modified Wan's system to include complementary layers as suggested by Munro because both systems deal with visual content and displaying multiple images from a single file and it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to try displaying images as complementary layers with a reasonable expectation of success since it was known in the art.

Regarding claim 34, Wan does not teach the secondary image overlays the primary image.

Munro teaches the images can be placed in separate layers; the upper layer will overlay the lower one when there is an overlap which meets the limitation, ***wherein at***

least one secondary image overlays the primary image. See page 4-5, paragraph [0044].

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have modified Wan's system to include complementary layers as suggested by Munro because both systems deal with visual content and displaying multiple images from a single file and it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to try displaying images as complementary layers with a reasonable expectation of success since it was known in the art.

Regarding claim 35, Wan discloses a method for displaying information online such as through a web page which meets the preamble.

Wan discloses ***receiving a multi-image file via a network interface, wherein the multi-image file consists of a single data file comprising a primary image and a plurality of secondary images adapted for cooperative display.*** See figures 12-13, the <ImageGroup id> which is the multi-image file which is a single data file and <image href> tags which identify the primary and secondary images. Wan discloses the primary and secondary images can be different versions of an image such as of a rocket before it is launched and while it is launching. See figure 13.

Wan discloses ***identifying a first markup language tag specifying the multi-image file, the first markup language tag comprising code identifying the multi-image file and one or more second codes specifying images in the multi-image file for display.*** See figure 13, column 2, lines 39-67, column 17, lines 25-30 and

column 18, lines 1-20 where the code includes a tag for the image file (i.e. <ImageGroup id>) and the images in the file <image href>.

Wan discloses ***parsing the multi-image file to identify the one or more images specified by the second codes***. See figure 13, column 2, lines 39-67, column 17, lines 25-30 and column 18, lines 1-20 where a fragment identifier specifies which image to display.

Wan discloses ***simultaneously displaying the one or more images specified by the second code***. See the code in figure 13 where an image is identified.

Wan does not disclose detecting user interaction with a displayed image.

Munro discloses ***detecting user interaction with a displayed image***. See page 4, paragraph [0044] where a user can click on an image causing the browser to go to a new location.

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Wan's system with Munro's system for displaying multiple images including detecting user interaction with a displayed image because both Wan and Munro are drawn to displaying multiple images, all the claimed elements were known in the prior art and one skilled in the art could have combined the elements as claimed by known methods with no change in their respective functions, and the combination yielded nothing more than predictable results to one of ordinary skill in the art.

Wan further teaches ***identifying a second markup language tag specifying the multi-image file, the second markup language tag comprising the first code***

and one or more third codes specifying a second subset of images in the multi-image file; parsing the multi-image file to identify one or more images specified by the third codes; and simultaneously displaying one or more images specified by the third codes on the display unit . See figure 13 where a first code (i.e.

<ImageGroup id>) with one or more third codes (<image href='#Launching'>) specifying images in the multi-image file.

Regarding claim 36, Wan does not disclose the primary and secondary image comprise complementary layers.

Munro teaches the images can be placed in separate layers; the upper layer will overlay the lower one when there is an overlap which meets the limitation ***the primary image and the secondary image comprise complementary layers***. See page 4-5, paragraph [0044].

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have modified Wan's system to include complementary layers as suggested by Munro because both systems deal with visual content and displaying multiple images from a single file and it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to try displaying images as complementary layers with a reasonable expectation of success since it was known in the art.

Regarding claim 37, Wan does not teach the first set of images overlays a second set of images.

Munro teaches the images can be placed in separate layers; the upper layer will overlay the lower one when there is an overlap which meets the limitation, ***a first set of images. . . overlaying a second set of images***. See page 4-5, paragraph [0044].

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have modified Wan's system to include complementary layers as suggested by Munro because both systems deal with visual content and displaying multiple images from a single file and it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to try displaying images as complementary layers with a reasonable expectation of success since it was known in the art.

Regarding claim 38, Wan discloses the **multi-image file comprises an image descriptor for each of the plurality of images**. See figure 13 where each image has an image descriptor, column 2, lines 39-67, column 17, lines 25-30 and column 18, lines 1-20.

Regarding claim 39, Wan discloses ***parsing the multi-image file to identify the one or more images specified by the second codes comprises comparing the second codes to the image descriptors***. See figure 13, column 2, lines 39-67, column 17, lines 25-30 and column 18, lines 1-20 where a fragment identifier specifies which image to display.

Regarding claim 40, Wan does not expressly teach receiving an image file and detecting whether it is a conventional file and displaying the web page with the single image; however, Munro teaches *receiving an image file and detecting whether it is a conventional file and displaying the web page with the single image*. See pages 2-4.

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Wan's system with Munro's system for displaying multiple images including detecting user interaction with a displayed image because both Wan and Munro are drawn to displaying multiple images, all the claimed elements were known in the prior art and one skilled in the art could have combined the elements as claimed by known methods with no change in their respective functions, and the combination yielded nothing more than predictable results to one of ordinary skill in the art.

Regarding claim 41, Munro further teaches parsing a file for image descriptors. See paragraph [0029]. It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Wan's system with Munro's system for displaying multiple images including detecting user interaction with a displayed image because both Wan and Munro are drawn to displaying multiple images, all the claimed elements were known in the prior art and one skilled in the art could have combined the elements as claimed by known methods with no change in their respective functions,

and the combination yielded nothing more than predictable results to one of ordinary skill in the art.

Regarding claim 42, Wan discloses multi-image file comprises a ***primary image specification***. See figure 13 where the primary image is the first image, `<Imagehref='#BeforeLaunch'>`.

Regarding claim 43, Wan discloses displaying a primary image. While Wan does not expressly state displaying the primary image upon failure to identify an image specified by one or more second codes, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to display the image for which the code is recognized.

12. Claims 22, 28-32, and 34 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Munro et al., US 2002/0089549 A1, July 11, 2002 in view of Wan, US 7,461,168 B1, 12/02/08 (filed 09/15/00).

In reference to claim 22, Munro teaches a method, apparatus, and system for accessing images from the Internet on a webpage where the web page is written in XML, the browser displays the image in the web page. See page 1, paragraphs [0003]-[0008]. This meets the preamble, ***a method of displaying a web page***.

Munro discloses using standard HTML language to insert images into web pages. Images being displayed using a web browser a page description language such

as XML or HTML defines how to display these images. Standard HTML allows images of various types to be inserted into a web page using the HTML tag "IMG" which meets the bolded portions of the limitation, ***receiving a web page containing markup language tag via the network interface, the markup language tag comprising a code specifying a first subset of the images that should be displayed; and selectively displaying only the specified first subset of images from the multi-image file on a display unit.*** See page 3, paragraph [0029] and page 1, paragraph [0004].

In the **background of the invention**, Munro discloses that it was known to provide a composition of multiple images into a single image file and display the sole image file within a single window which meets the limitation, ***receiving a multi-image file, the multi-image file consists of a single data file comprising a primary image and a plurality of secondary images adapted for cooperative display.*** See page 1, paragraph [0008].

However, Munro does not expressly state that the HTML tag received identifies a subset of the multi-image file for display.

Wan discloses receiving an HTML file which identifies a subset of images of the multi-image file that should be displayed See figures 12-13, column 2, lines 39-67, column 17, lines 25-30 and column 18, lines 1-20 where the code indicates which images of the multi-image file should be displayed or which "fragment" of a resource should be displayed which meets the limitation, ***the markup language tag comprising a code specifying a first subset of the images in the multi-image file that should be displayed. . . displaying only the specified subset of images.*** Specifically, the

images "BeforeLaunch" and "Launching" should be displayed from the image file "RocketImages".

A person of ordinary skill in the art had good reason to pursue known options within his or her technical grasp. At the time of the invention, it was known to specify a first subset of images in a multi-image file with a markup language tag, as suggested by Wan. Thus, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to try Wan's identification of a subset of images in a multi-image file that should be displayed within the system of Munro with a reasonable expectation of success.

In reference to claim 28, Munro teaches storing multiple images in a single image file. The multiple images can make up a composition of thumbnail type images for simultaneous display in a browser window. See page 1, paragraph [0008]. The bitmap image has a hierarchal system of folders associated with the bitmap image. See page 1, paragraph [0009]. This meets the limitation, **the plurality of independent images comprises a menu item**.

In reference to claim 29, Munro teaches the using standard HTML language to insert images into web pages. Images being displayed using a web browser a page description language such as XML or HTML defines how to display these images. Standard HTML allows images of various types to be inserted into a web page using the HTML tag "IMG" which meets the limitation, **wherein the markup language tag**

comprises an HTML code. See page 3, paragraph [0029] and page 1, paragraph [0004].

Regarding claim 30, claim 30 is drawn to the program product performing the method of claim 22 above. Therefore, claim 30 is rejected under the same rationale used in claim 22 above and further in view of the teachings that the images can comprise primary and secondary images which meets the limitation ***including a primary image and at least one secondary image***. See page 4-5, paragraph [0044].

Regarding claim 31, Munro discloses the program comprises a web browser. See page 1, paragraph [0004], page 2, paragraph [0027], and figure 1.

Regarding claim 32, Munro teaches the images can be placed in separate layers; the upper layer will overlay the lower one when there is an overlap which meets the limitation ***the primary image and the secondary image comprise complementary layers***. See page 4-5, paragraph [0044].

Regarding claim 34, Munro teaches the images can be placed in separate layers; the upper layer will overlay the lower one when there is an overlap which meets the limitation, ***wherein at least one secondary image overlays the primary image***. See page 4-5, paragraph [0044].

13. Claims 26-27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Munro et al., US 2002/0089549 A1, July 11, 2002 in view of Wan, US 7,461,168 B1, 12/02/08 (filed 09/15/00) and Miller et al., US 2005/0185055 A1, 08/25/05 (filed 12/08/00).

In reference to claims 26-27, Munro does not teach in response to an event displaying the web page with a secondary image wherein the event is a mouse-over event; however, Miller does. Miller teaches user instructions are also displayed, to tell the user to click on the "nicest looking" small picture, which then appears in the preferred image window. The user uses a standard input device, such as the **mouse**, to make this selection in block. For example, if the user preferred the appearance of the image with lower than normal contrast, the user would click on image. In response, the CPU would update the display on the display monitor so that the image displayed in preferred image window had lower than normal contrast, matching the contrast of the selected image, and move the indicator to surround image. At this point, the user can select a different image from among images, in order to display images with other appearances as large images in the preferred image window, or the user can select the "done" icon. See page 4, paragraph [0036]. This meets the limitation, ***in response to an event displaying the web page with a secondary image wherein the event is a mouse-over event.*** It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate a mouse-over event for displaying the web page with a secondary image, as taught by Miller, within the system of Munro as a

means for displaying a second image because it enables interactive functions to be used by the user allowing them to carry out image manipulations. See page 4, paragraph [0036].

14. Claims 23-25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Munro et al., US 2002/0089549 A1, July 11, 2002 in view of Wan, US 7,461,168 B1, 12/02/08 (filed 09/15/00) and Tucker et al., US 2004/0049598 A1, 03/11/04 (filed 02/23/01).

Regarding claim 23, Munro does not teach an *information header containing an image name for each image*; however, Tucker discloses an image data header. See figure 12, 1216. The image data header supports multiple images of multiple types. The image descriptor follows the image header and describes the image data which meets the limitation, *information header containing an image name for each image*. See pages 7-8, paragraphs [0058]-[0061].

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate Tucker's image header in the system of Munro as it provides information about images located in the file in a manner that is efficient and quickly visible. See abstract and pages 7-8, paragraphs [0058]-[0061].

Regarding claim 24, Munro does not teach an information header comprises a primary image indicator; however, Tucker discloses an image data header. See figure

Art Unit: 2176

12, 1216. The image data header supports multiple images of multiple types which meets the limitation, ***a primary image indicator***. The image descriptor follows the image header and describes the image data. See pages 7-8, paragraphs [0058]-[0061].

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate Tucker's image header in the system of Munro as it provides information about images located in the file in a manner that is efficient and quickly visible. See abstract and pages 7-8, paragraphs [0058]-[0061].

Regarding claim 25, Munro does not teach an information header comprises an image location in the multi-image file for each image; however, Tucker discloses an image data header. See figure 12, 1216. The image data header supports multiple images of multiple types. The image descriptor follows the image header and describes the image data which meets the limitation, ***an information header comprises an image location in the multi-image file for each image***. See pages 7-8, paragraphs [0058]-[0061].

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate Tucker's image header in the system of Munro as it provides information about images located in the file in a manner that is efficient and quickly visible. See abstract and pages 7-8, paragraphs [0058]-[0061].

Response to Arguments

15. Applicant's remarks filed 09/21/09 have been fully considered.

The claim objections have been withdrawn in light of Applicant's amendments. The rejections under 35 USC 101 for claims 30-34 have been maintained since Applicant has defined "storage media" as "signal bearing media" in the Specification on page 11. The rejections under 35 USC 101 for claims 22--29 and 35-43 have been withdrawn in light of Applicant's amendments. The rejections under 35 USC 112, second paragraph have been maintained because it is not clear if claims 30-32 and 34 are claiming a product or a process, thus making the claim indefinite.

On pages 13-14, Applicant argues Munro describes a single image file rendered as a mosaic of multiple pictures, not a single file containing multiple images. Applicant argues Munro does not contain multiple, independent images in a single file.

Examiner disagrees because the Background of the Invention section of Munro does state that it was known to provide a composition of multiple images put together into a single file for display. See page 1, paragraph [0008]. However, Munro does not teach specifying a first subset of images that should be displayed, as amended. In light of Applicant's amendments, a new rejection under 35 USC 103 over Munro in view of Wan has been provided above. Thus, Applicant's arguments with respect to Munro are considered moot.

On page 15, Applicant argues Miller and Tucker fail to teach the same elements argued above. Applicant's arguments have been considered but are considered moot in light of the new grounds of rejection presented above.

On pages 15-16, Applicant argues Wan fails to teach a multi-image file consisting of a single data file comprising a primary image and a plurality of second images. Applicant further argues the <ImageGroup id> in figures 12-13 just identifies a particular file for download and does not identify a multi-image file that consists of a single data file.

Examiner disagrees.

Wan discloses **receiving** a single data file (i.e. identified by the <ImageGroup id>) comprising **multiple images** such as images related to a Rocket Launch including a BeforeLaunch image and a Launching image. Thus, Wan discloses a "multi-image file consisting of a single data file comprising a primary image and a secondary image adapted for cooperative display".

Applicant further argues Wan merely identifies a particular file for download and thus does not teach a multi-image file.

Examiner disagrees.

Wan's file for download such as the ImageGroup "RocketImages" is a single file comprised of multiple images such as a BeforeLaunch image and a Launching image. Thus, Wan clearly teaches a multi-image file consists of a single data file.

In view of the comments above, the rejection is maintained.

Conclusion

16. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

17. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to RACHNA S. DESAI whose telephone number is (571)272-4099. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F (8:30AM-6:00PM).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Doug Hutton can be reached on 571-272-4137. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

/Rachna S Desai/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2176
12/21/09